

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 remain pending in the application.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider earlier rejections in light of the following amendments and remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

The Applicant respectfully requests the **withdrawal** of the Finality of the Office Action as the previous amendment made no changes to the claims. The current Office Action further develops and in some cases is the first time that the Examiner responds to remarks made by Applicant in a prior Amendment.

Claims 1-15 over Havinis in view of Lam

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,557 to Havinis in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0072318 to Lam et al. ("Lam"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1-15 recite establishing a **User Plane roaming** interface between a **roaming wireless device** and a visited location service (V-LCS) manager via an intermediary home Location Services (H-LCS) manager associated with the roaming wireless device.

Havinis's patent teaches a method to allow a GPRS network to establish "special" GPRS PDP context (i.e. IP connectivity) for LCS service, in which he assumes the overall control plane system (i.e. control plane, including the GPRS radio protocol stack, see the protocol architecture below) is aware that the service request is for LCS service. This is not a valid assumption for User Plane based location services. Havinis' patent was written at a time when GMLC was responsible for retrieving location for all location requests targeting a mobile station.

The Examiner responds to the Applicant's previous argument in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action that Havinis fails to teach application to a wireless device while roaming, much less establishing a roaming interface between a roaming wireless device and a visited location service (V-

LCS) manager via an intermediary home Location Services (H-LCS) manager associated with the roaming wireless device (see Office Action, page 2). The Examiner responds to Applicant's previous argument by going into a great deal of detail explaining what Havinis discloses (see Office Action, pages 2 and 3). However, in **ALL** of the Examiner's explanation of Havinis' disclosure, the Examiner has still failed to show that Havinis discloses use **EITHER** a **roaming wireless device, visited location service (V-LCS) manager** **or** a **home Location Services (H-LCS) manager**, much less of establishing a **User Plane roaming interface** between a **roaming wireless device** and a visited location service (V-LCS) manager via an intermediary home Location Services (H-LCS) manager associated with the roaming wireless device, as recited by claims 1-15.

The Examiner acknowledges that Havinis fails to "teach directing IP connectivity over the internet capable of being transmitted through a firewall in a home wireless carrier network and through a firewall in a visited wireless carrier network." (see Office Action, page 4) The Examiner relies on Lam to allegedly make up for the serious acknowledged deficiencies in Havinis to arrive at the claimed features.

Lam teaches optimization of routing and QoS control for IP traffic of GPRS PDP context (IP link). Lam fails to teach a **User Plane roaming interface** between a roaming wireless device and a V-LCS via an intermediary H-LCS, as claimed. Lam fails to teach any application to a wireless device while it is roaming, i.e., a visited carrier network, much less **two** location managers, establishing a **User Plane roaming interface** between a roaming wireless device and a visited location service (V-LCS) manager, much less via an intermediary home Location Services (H-LCS) manager, as recited by claims 1-15.

Havinis in view of Lam, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest establishing a **User Plane roaming interface** between a wireless device and a visited location service (V-LCS) manager, much less via an intermediary home Location Services (H-LCS) manager, as recited by claims 1-15.

For these reasons alone claims 1-15 are patentable.

Moreover, claims 1-10 recite directing IP connectivity over a User Plane roaming interface between a home LCS manager and a visited LCS manager through a firewall in a home wireless carrier network and through a firewall in a visited wireless carrier network.

The Examiner alleges that Lam teaches “that it is well known to use firewalls between home carrier networks and visited carrier networks.” (see Office Action, page 3). But, Lam fails to teach any application to a wireless device while it is **roaming**, i.e, a visited carrier networks. Thus, Lam fails to disclose, teach or suggest a firewall in a visited wireless carrier network and another firewall in a home wireless carrier network, much less directing IP connectivity over a User Plane roaming interface between a home LCS manager and a visited LCS manager through a firewall in a home wireless carrier network and through a firewall in a visited wireless carrier network, as recited by claims 1-10.

Thus, Havinis in view of Lam, either alone or in combination, still fails to disclose, teach or suggest establishing a User Plane roaming interface between a roaming wireless device and a visited location service (V-LCS) manager via an intermediary home Location Services (H-LCS) manager associated with the roaming wireless device, and directing IP connectivity over a User Plane roaming interface between a home LCS manager and a visited LCS manager through a firewall in a home wireless carrier network and through a firewall in a visited wireless carrier network, as recited by claims 1-10.

For these additional reasons, claims 1-10 are patentable.

Furthermore, claims 11-15 recite that a message tunneling mechanism is formed between a visited location service (V-LCS) manager and a roaming wireless device.

As discussed above, neither Havinis nor Lam teach a roaming wireless device, much less disclose a visited location service (V-LCS) manager. Thus, it follows that Havinis and Lam also fail to disclose a message tunneling mechanism formed between a visited location service (V-LCS) manager and a roaming wireless device, as recited by claims 1-15. Thus, Havinis in view of

Lam, either alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest establishing a User Plane roaming interface between a roaming wireless device and a visited location service (V-LCS) manager via an intermediary home Location Services (H-LCS) manager associated with the roaming wireless device; and a message tunneling mechanism formed between a visited location service (V-LCS) manager and a roaming wireless device, as recited by claims 11-15.

For at least these reasons, claims 1-15 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307
WHB/df